



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,600	12/05/2001	Viveka Linde	ALBIHNW-424	3512
21003	7590	03/03/2009	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA 44TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498			RUDY, ANDREW J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3687	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DLNYDOCKET@BAKERBOTTS.COM

1                   UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2  
3  
4                   BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
5                   AND INTERFERENCES  
6  
7

8                   *Ex parte* VIVEKA LINDE and MATS LINDE  
9  
10

11                   Appeal 2008-4097  
12                   Application 10/006,600  
13                   Technology Center 3600  
14  
15

16                   Decided:<sup>1</sup> February 27, 2009  
17  
18

19                   Before MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, DAVID B. WALKER, and BIBHU R.  
20                   MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.  
21

22                   CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.  
23

24                   DECISION ON APPEAL  
25

26                   STATEMENT OF THE CASE

---

<sup>1</sup> The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, begins to run from the decided date shown on this page of the decision. The time period does not run from the Mail Date (paper delivery) or Notification Date (electronic delivery).

1       Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a non-final  
2 rejection of claims 1 to 3. Claims 4 to 7 have been withdrawn from  
3 consideration. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

4       Appellants invented a method of determining the post-launch  
5 performance of a product on a market (Specification 1).

6       Claim 1 under appeal reads as follows:

7           1. A method for determining the post-launch performance  
8           of a product on a market, comprising:

9              storing, in a database, collected first data related to at  
10             least one key success factor associated with at least a market  
11             performance which is related to said product;

12              storing, in a database, collected second data related to  
13             unmet product needs on said market;

14              storing, in a database, collected third data related to a  
15             propensity of a decision-maker to choose said product;

16              linking a computer to said databases; and

17              using a simulation model on said computer to calculate a  
18             future market share of said product based on said collected first,  
19             second, and third data, thereby determining said post-launch  
20             performance on said market.

22       The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112,  
23 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly  
24 point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Appellant regards  
25 as the invention. The Examiner is of the opinion that the phrase “related to”  
26 in lines 3, 5 and 7 of claim 1 is not clear.

27       The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as  
28 being unpatentable over Delurgio.

29       The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on  
30 appeal is:

31       Delurgio et al.                   US 7,092,896 B2                   Aug. 15, 2006

1

## ISSUES

2       Have the Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in holding that the  
3       phrase “related to” in lines 3, 5 and 7 of claim 1 is unclear?  
4       Have the Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting the  
5       claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delurgio,  
6       because Delurgio does not disclose or suggest using a simulation model on a  
7       computer to calculate future market share of a product and thereby  
8       determine the post-launch performance on the market from data related to  
9       one key success factor, unmet product needs on the market, and a propensity  
10      of a decision maker to choose the product?

11

## FINDINGS OF FACT

12       Delurgio discloses a promotion optimization method for a group of  
13       products within a store or group of stores (col. 5, ll. 35 to 38). Delurgio  
14       discloses that three main elements must be balanced in order to produce an  
15       optimized plan (col. 5, ll. 53 to 55). The three elements are merchandising  
16       events 101, supplier offers 102 and rules and objectives 103 (col. 5, ll. 55 to  
17       57). Exemplary types of merchandising events 101 are featured displays,  
18       advertising and variously types of temporary price reductions such as  
19       coupons (col. 5, ll. 61 to 65). Rules and objectives include timing and  
20       frequency of promotions, objectives of the promotion such as maximizing  
21       volume, revenue and profit (col. 6, ll. 21 to 26). Delurgio includes an  
22       optimization engine 234 connected to a results processor 233 which receives  
23       data from a customer data base 238 (Figure 2). The customer data base 238  
24       includes customer data sets 239 corresponding to a plurality of customers  
25

1 (col. 7, ll. 14 to 15). The customer data sets include point of sale data from  
2 files on the customer computers 210 and supplier offers (col. 7, ll. 16 to 22).  
3 Delurgio does not disclose storing data related to at least one key success  
4 factor associated with at least a market performance related to a product.  
5 Delurgio does not disclose storing data related to unmet product needs in the  
6 market. Therefore, it follows that Delurgio does not disclose a simulation  
7 model that calculates a future market share based on the one key success  
8 factor, unmet product need and propensity of a decision maker to choose the  
9 product.

10

## 11 PRINCIPLES OF LAW

### 12 Indefiniteness

13 The second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 requires claims to set out  
14 and circumscribe a particular area with a reasonable degree of precision and  
15 particularity. *In re Johnson*, 558 F.2d 1008, 1015 (CCPA 1977). In making  
16 this determination, the definiteness of the language employed in the claims  
17 must be analyzed, not in a vacuum, but always in light of the teachings of  
18 the prior art and of the particular application disclosure as it would be  
19 interpreted by one possessing the ordinary level of skill in the pertinent art.

20 *Id.*

21 The Examiner's focus during examination of claims for compliance  
22 with the requirement for definiteness of 35 U.S.C.  
23 § 112, second paragraph, is whether the claims meet the threshold  
24 requirements of clarity and precision, not whether more suitable language or  
25 modes of expression are available. Some latitude in the manner of

1 expression and the aptness of terms is permitted even though the claim  
2 language is not as precise as the examiner might desire. If the scope of the  
3 invention sought to be patented cannot be determined from the language of  
4 the claims with a reasonable degree of certainty, a rejection of the claims  
5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is appropriate.

6 Furthermore, Appellants may use functional language, alternative  
7 expressions, negative limitations, or any style of expression or format of  
8 claim which makes clear the boundaries of the subject matter for which  
9 protection is sought. As noted by the Court in *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d  
10 2106 (CCPA 1971), a claim may not be rejected solely because of the type  
11 of language used to define the subject matter for which patent protection is  
12 sought.

13       Obviousness

14       An invention is not patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 if it is obvious.  
15 *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1745-46 (2007). The facts  
16 underlying an obviousness inquiry include: Under § 103, the scope and  
17 content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior  
18 art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary  
19 skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background the obviousness  
20 or nonobviousness of the subject matter is determined. Such secondary  
21 considerations as commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, failure  
22 of others, etc., might be utilized to give light to the circumstances  
23 surrounding the origin of the subject matter sought to be patented. *Graham*  
24 *v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966).

25

1 ANALYSIS

2 We will not sustain the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 to 3 under 35  
3 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. We agree with Appellants that the phrase  
4 "related to" following the noun "data" is a descriptor of the type of data  
5 claimed. Pages 7 and 9 of the Specification explains that information  
6 regarding success factors, unmet product need and propensity of a decision  
7 maker to choose the product is crucial for the determination of the future  
8 sales of the product. As such, the phrase meets the threshold requirements  
9 of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for clarity and precision.

10 We will not sustain the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 to 3 under 35  
11 U.S.C. § 103(a) because the Examiner has not established that Delurgio  
12 discloses or suggests the subject matter recited in claim 1 from which claims  
13 2 and 3 depend. Specifically, Delurgio does not disclose the step of using a  
14 simulation model to calculate future market share based on data related to a  
15 key success factor and unmet product needs as is required by claim 1. While  
16 Delurgio does disclose an optimization engine that utilizes data to predict  
17 sales and market share, the Examiner has not directed our attention to any  
18 disclosure or suggestion of the storage or analysis of success factors and  
19 unmet product needs.

20  
21 DECISION

22 The decision of the Examiner is reversed.

23  
24 REVERSED  
25

Appeal 2008-4097  
Application 10/006,600

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 LV:  
13  
14  
15  
16 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
17 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
18 44TH FLOOR  
19 NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498  
20  
21  
22